DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 638 EA 020 796

AUTHOR	Ladd, Helen F.; Wilson, Julie Boatright
TITLE	Education and Tax Limitations: Evidence from Massachusetts' Proposition 2 1/2.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jan 82
GRANT	NIE-G-81-0006
NOTE	86p.; Part of a larger study receiving supplemental funds from the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge, MA. For related documents, see EA 020 795-798.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Retrenchment; School Surveys; *Tax Allocation; *Tax Effort; *Taxes; *Tax Rates
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This paper uses survey data collected during the 2 weeks following the November 4, 1980, election to answer questions concerning how local public education should be funded in the wake of the passing of Proposition 2 1/2, a measure that requires high tax rate cities and towns to reduce property tax levies by at least 15 percent per year until they reach the maximum allowable rate of 2 1/2 percent of fair market value. Communities with low tax rates are allowed to raise property taxes but by no more than 2 1/2 percent per year. In four sections, the link between views about education and support for tax limitation are reviewed. Section 1 decribes the provision and financing of education in Massachusetts. Section 2 disentangles the effects of education-related motivations from other factors influencing the votes on Proposition 2 1/2. Section 3 describes how views about education are distributed across various subgroups of the population. Section 4 summarizes the findings, which showed that Massachusett's household heads were relatively satisfied with the level of public education services; however, they felt that the passage of Proposition 2 1/2 would lead to greater control by voters over public spending. Extensive appendixes present the voting model; statistics on voters' views of fiscal issues; and their expectations of the effects of passage of the proposition. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306638

EDUCATION AND TAX LIMITATIONS:
EVIDENCE FROM MASSACHUSETTS' PROPOSITION 2½

Helen F. Ladd
and
Julie Boatright Wilson

Program in City and Regional Planning
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

January 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper is part of a larger study funded by the National Institute of Education, grant no. NIE-G-81-0006, with supplemental funds from the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge, Massachusetts. The authors are grateful to Claire Christopherson for her expert computer programming.

This paper is also available from the Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard University as Joint Center Working Paper no. 74.

EA 020 796

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On November 4, 1980 Massachusetts voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 2 1/2. This tax limitation measure takes its name from its major provisions: high tax rate cities and towns are required to reduce property tax levies by at least 15 percent per year until they reach the maximum allowable rate of 2 1/2 percent of fair market value. Communities with low tax rates are allowed to raise property taxes but by no more than 2 1/2 percent per year. In the same election, voters turned down by a 36 to 64 percent margin an alternative measure, Question 3, sponsored by the Massachusetts Teachers' Association (MTA). This alternative would have limited the growth of both state and local taxes and increased the state share of education costs to 50 percent over a three-year period.

How local public education should be financed was clearly a major issue in the vote on Question 3. Education issues also influenced the vote on Proposition 2 1/2, however, even though its major thrust was property tax reduction. After all, property taxes provide the major source of funds for elementary and secondary education, education budgets account for the largest share of local expenditures, and the measure specifically returned the power to set school budgets to the municipality. What specific messages were voters trying to send when they voted for Proposition 2 1/2 but against Question 3? Did they want to reduce education services and spending? Or was local control over school budgets the major concern?

This paper uses survey data collected during the two weeks following the November 4, 1980 election to answer these and other questions related to the link between views about education and support for tax limitation. Section I describes the provision and financing of education in Massachusetts; Section II disentangles the effects of education-related motivations from other factors motivating the votes on Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3; Section III describes how views about education are distributed across various subgroups of the population; and Section IV summarizes the findings.

I. BACKGROUND

Education Spending and Finance in Massachusetts

Elementary and secondary education in Massachusetts is provided by local school districts and financed heavily by local property taxes, while higher education is primarily a state responsibility financed by tuition and state taxes. In FY 1981 the state government appropriated $333 million for higher education, and about three times that amount for assistance to local public schools. Altogether, local, state and federal expenditures on local public schools in FY 1981 exceeded $2.25 billion.

The boundaries of school districts are typically coincident with those of Massachusetts' 351 cities and towns. The school districts are run by elected school committees and have no taxing power of their own. Before Proposition 2 1/2, cities and towns had no direct control over school committee budgets but were required to raise the necessary school property taxes as part of the regular municipal levy. Proposition 2 1/2 reduced the fiscal autonomy of school committees by giving local legislative bodies (city councils or town meetings) power to alter school committee budgets.[1]

In addition to the 297 cities and towns that operate instructional programs, there are 54 regional academic school districts and 27 vocational districts. Before Proposition 2 1/2, school committees for each of these regional and vocational districts determined the budget and allocated costs among member communities according to agreements made at the time the district was formed. Proposition 2 1/2 limits the fiscal autonomy of these regional school committees in the same way that it limits the power of local school committees.[2]

---

[1] The Massachusetts Department of Revenue has ruled that school committees lose control over only the total appropriation; they retain control over the allocation of expenditures across categories.

[2] The treatment of regional school districts under Proposition 2 1/2 was initially unclear. The issue was whether they should be treated like special districts or like local schools. The Department of Revenue ruled that they should be treated like local schools.

Tremendous variation exists in fiscal capacity, property tax burdens, and education spending across school districts. An equalizing state aid program helps to offset some of the differences in fiscal capacity and needs across districts, but school aid in Massachusetts accounted for only 37 percent of total state and local own-source revenues for schools in 1980. This contrasts with 52 percent in the nation as a whole. Consequently, disparities in per pupil education spending are larger in Massachusetts than elsewhere.[1] These disparities have led to continued pressures for additional state aid for education and, recently, to a court case (Webbe v. King) challenging Massachusetts' system of education finance.

Table I shows that local education expenditures have continued to grow in recent years despite declining enrollments; between 1975-76 and 1979-80, total expenditures grew 29 percent while the number of pupils declined by 13 percent. Moreover, the 47 percent growth in per pupil expenditures during this period represents substantial growth in real terms.[2]

Some have blamed the increase in per pupil spending on the autonomy of school committees. This claim is difficult to evaluate. On the one hand, school committees are elected and, like other public officials, are directly accountable to the voters. On the other hand, with autonomous school committees, local legislative bodies are unable to make explicit trade-offs between education and all other spending.

---

[1] 1977 data from the Center for Education Statistics shows that the disparity between per pupil expenditures for pupils at the 5th and 95th percentiles of education spending was larger in Massachusetts than in any other state. The newly revised school aid program of 1979 does not seem to have changed the situation. In 1981 testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, former Education Commissioner Gregory Anrig claimed that Massachusetts continued to rank first in the nation for differences in per pupil spending between wealthy and poor communities.

[2] This statement is based on the comparable 35 percent increase in the implicit price deflator for state and local government purchases of goods and services. Economic Report of the President, January 1981 (Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1980).

Table I

EDUCATION EXPENDITURES

School year	Expenditures (millions)	Pupils	Per pupil Expenditures
1975-76	$1,761.1	1,177,536	$1,496
1976-77	1,943.6	1,146,839	1,695
1977-78	2,005.0	1,107,174	1,811
1978-79	2,148.1	1,078,550	1,992
1979-80	2,276.7	1,032,691	2,205
Percent change	29.3%	-12.3%	47.3%

Source: Massachusetts Department of Education, Per Pupil Expenditure 1979-80.

Others have blamed rising per pupil expenditures on state-mandated programs for children with learning disabilities. Massachusetts pioneered in the field of special education with a 1972 law requiring local school districts to provide special education services for all children who needed it. Expenditures under this program grew from $104 million in 1973-74 to $335 million in 1979-80. Between 1975 and 1978, a disproportionate share of this growth in costs was financed with local property taxes because the state government underfunded education aid programs. Since the revision of the school aid formula in 1979, the growth in costs has been distributed more evenly across the state and local governments. In 1979-80, 60 percent of total expenditures for special education were borne by local governments, 33 percent by the state government, and 7 percent by the federal government.

Tax Limitation Measures and Education

Proposition 2 1/2's revenue provisions affect all cities and towns, and hence school districts, in the state but hurt some more than others. High tax rate communities are required to lower tax levies by 15 percent per year until they reach the maximum allowable effective rate of 2 1/2 percent (equivalent to $25 per $1000 of full cash value). Communities with tax rates below 2 1/2 percent are allowed to increase tax levies but by no more than 2 1/2 percent per year, regardless of growth in the tax base or in service needs.[1] In addition, Proposition 2 1/2 lowers the motor vehicle excise tax rate from $66 to $25 per $1000. This tax is imposed at a uniform statewide rate but accrues to local treasuries. Along with the local property tax it provides the only tax revenue available to Massachusetts cities and towns.

Initial estimates suggested that the first year revenue loss from these measures would be close to $600 million. July 1, 1981 estimates lowered the expected first year revenue loss to $486 million, or about 14 percent of 1981 local tax revenues. All large cities and towns

---

[1] Communities with 1979 effective tax rates below 2 1/2 percent are required to use their 1979 tax rate rather than 2 1/2 percent as their tax rate limit.

face first year revenue losses larger than this statewide average, and many face additional required reductions in future years.[1] Importantly, the proposition provided for no additional state aid to offset these local revenue losses. At the same time, new state aid was not ruled out because the proposition placed no limit on state government taxing and spending powers.

In response to the threat of Proposition 2 1/2, the Massachusetts Teachers' Association (MTA) put a counter-proposal on the November ballot. This initiative petition would have limited the growth of both state and local taxes to the growth of personal income in the state and would have increased the state's share of education costs to 50 percent over a three-year period. With this proposal, the MTA hoped either to weaken support for Proposition 2 1/2, or if both passed, to have the more lenient provisions of its proposal take precedence over the stringent provisions of Proposition 2 1/2 in those areas where the two overlapped. Once the campaign began, however, the MTA did not push its proposition very hard, believing that a single unified message (that is, do not vote for Proposition 2 1/2) would be stronger than two messages (do not vote for Proposition 2 1/2 and do vote for the MTA proposal).[2]

Education groups waged an active campaign against Proposition 2 1/2. The State Board of Education worked with the Massachusetts Teachers' Association, the Massachusetts Superintendents, and the Association of School Committees to provide information to voters. The Commissioner of Education campaigned vigorously across the state and education groups communicated constantly with other groups campaigning against the measure. The Commissioner of Education took pride in the campaign. Although sorrowful that "we lost," he believed it was a good campaign, that the voters were fully informed, and that Proposition 2 1/2 clearly reflected the "will of the people."[3]

---

[1]For a full discussion of the first year revenue losses under Proposition 2 1/2, see Katherine L. Bradbury and Helen F. Ladd, with Claire Christopherson, "Proposition 2 1/2: Initial Impacts."

[2]This discussion is based on an interview with Jack Pacheco of the Massachusetts Teachers Association on August 28, 1981.

[3]Based on an interview with former Commissioner of Education, Gregory Anrig, June 11, 1981.

II. EDUCATION ISSUES AND THE VOTES ON PROPOSITION 2 1/2 AND QUESTION 3

To determine the "will of the people," a comprehensive half-hour telephone survey was administered to 1561 Massachusetts household heads by a professional survey research firm during the two weeks following the election. Survey respondents, half of whom were men and half women, were randomly selected from 58 cities and towns that are representative of all the cities and towns in the state.[1]

This section summarizes the education-related results from two multivariate models of voting behavior estimated from the survey data. Each model--one explaining the vote on Proposition 2 1/2 and the other explaining the vote on Question 3--includes variables representing the major factors motivating a "yes" or "no" vote on that measure. The comprehensiveness of each model makes it possible to separate the effects of education issues from other policy-related issues that might have motivated the vote.

Table II provides an overview of the model explaining the vote on Proposition 2 1/2. The model includes variables representing voters' preferences and attitudes toward several fiscal concerns, as well as expectations about how Proposition 2 1/2 would affect these concerns. Estimated using ordinary least squares, the equation includes 45 variables and is based on the 1114 voters for whom full information was available.[2] This full model includes nine education-related variables derived from respondents' stated preferences, perceptions or expectations about levels of education services and spending, the efficiency with which school services are provided, and the way education is financed.

---

[1] For a complete description of the survey and the sampling plan, see Appendices A, B and C of Helen F. Ladd and Julie Boatright Wilson, "Proposition 2 1/2: Explaining the Vote."

[2] The full equation is reported in Appendix A and discussed more fully in Helen F. Ladd and Julie Boatright Wilson, "Why Voters Support Tax Limitations: Evidence from Massachusetts' Proposition 2 1/2."

Table II

Overview of Proposition 2½ Voting Model

Issues Motivating Voting Behavior (1)	Variables: Preferences, Perceptions and Attitudes (2)	Variables: Expectations about Effects of Proposition 2-1/2 (3)
1. Service levels	Preferences for clusters of services	Expected effects on clusters of services; expected effects on services used by respondent's household.
2. Inefficiency and waste (cost of public services)	Perceptions of inefficiency or waste in: - state government - local government - local public schools	Expectations of more responsible government, more efficiency in local government, more voter control over schools.
3. Spending and taxes	Desired spending and taxing by: - state government - local government - local public schools	Expected effects on state and local taxes; expected effects on taxes paid by respondent's household.
4. Tax reform (tax shift)	Desired tax shifts. Attitudes toward taxes.	Expectations about state aid and about tax reform.
5. Relative fiscal status	Perceptions of how other groups fare relative to household.	----------
6. Public sector job status	----------	Public sector employee as proxy for fear of job loss or decline in quality of work environment.

Most of the education-related variables exert statistically significant effects on the probability that an individual household head will support Proposition 2 1/2. In particular, the equation implies that the desire to reduce the quality and quantity of education services, the belief that education services are inefficiently provided, the desire to shift more of the burden of education finance to state taxes or user charges and the expectation that Proposition 2 1/2 would increase voter control over school budgets all increase the probability that any given voter would support the tax limitation measure.

The contribution of each variable to the overall statewide vote of household heads depends both on the effect of the particular variable on the probability that an individual household head would support Proposition 2 1/2 and on the distribution of that variable across household heads within the state. For example, the equation shows that people who want to reduce education services are more likely than those who want to maintain or increase these services to vote "yes" on Proposition 2 1/2; the impact of these preferences on the overall statewide vote is small, however, because of the small proportion of people wanting such reductions. The first entry in Table III shows that the estimated magnitude of this impact is 0.8 percentage points. In other words, the results imply that the favorable vote for Proposition 2 1/2 would have been 0.8 percentage points lower than the actual vote had no Massachusetts household head wanted to reduce education (and recreation) services.

The other entries in Table III can be interpreted in a similar way. Together they show the impacts on the statewide vote for Proposition 2 1/2 of all the education-related variables in the full model, controlling for all other motivations. They were derived by comparing the voting outcome based on the actual distributions of views with the voting outcomes predicted to occur had no one wanted or expected any change in each aspect of education finance or service delivery. Thus, the total in the net column implies that, overall, the education-related views of household heads throughout the state

Table III

SUMMARY OF WEIGHTED IMPACTS OF EDUCATION VARIABLES

ON TOTAL PROPOSITION 2½ VOTE[a]

Variable	Weighted Impact on Total Vote		
	For	Against	Net
Service Levels[b]			
Preferences for education and recreation--less	0.008		
--more		-0.015	
			-0.007
Expectations about education and recreation--less		-0.061	
--more	0.001		
			-0.060
Spending			
Want decrease in school spending	0.023		0.023
Expect decrease in school spending		-0.041	-0.041
Efficiency and Control			
Perception of inefficiency in local schools	0.031		0.031
Expect more voter control over school spending	0.090		0.090
Finance Reform			
Shift of more education financing to state taxes	0.016		0.016
Shift of more special education financing to state taxes	0.005		0.005
Shift financing of some services to user charges[c]	0.015		0.015
	0.189	-0.117	0.072

Table III, continued

[a]Derived from the nine education-related variables included in a linear equation estimated from 1,114 survey observations to explain the probability of a "yes" vote on Proposition 2 1/2. Each entry is the predicted difference between the actual statewide vote of household heads and the hypothetical vote had no household head wanted or expected a change in that aspect of education, controlling for all other variables in the model. The full model is reported and interpreted in Helen F. Ladd and Julie Boatright Wilson, "Why Voters Support Tax Limitations: Evidence from Massachusetts' Proposition 2 1/2" in Tax Limitations in Massachusetts, unpublished report to the National Institute of Education, 1982.

[b]Education and recreation is the primary education-related service cluster. Not included in this table is the human services cluster which includes special education along with mental health programs and programs for the elderly.

[c]These services include adult education, after school programs, and local public transportation.

contributed 7.2 percentage points to the 58 percent favorable vote on Proposition 2 1/2.[1]

Several conclusions emerge from Table III. First, the finding that views on education-related issues together contributed only 7.2 percentage points to the favorable vote suggests that the vote for tax limitation in Massachusetts should not be interpreted as a general revolt against local schools and the way they are operated. Disaggregating this net impact, however, shows that certain views toward education contributed 18.9 percentage points to the favorable vote, while others contributed 11.7 percentage points to the negative vote. More than half the 18.9 percentage points of support for Proposition 2 1/2 comes from perceptions and expectations related to efficiency and voter control; beliefs that Proposition 2 1/2 would lead to more voter control over school spending contributed 9.0 percentage points to the favorable vote, and perceptions that local school services are inefficiently provided contributed another 3.1 percentage points.

In contrast to the large contribution of views about efficiency and voter control, desires for lower levels of spending or services contributed only small amounts to the statewide favorable vote. The desire for lower education and recreation services added only 0.8 percentage points to the favorable vote and the desire to reduce school spending, as distinct from service levels, contributed another 2.3 percentage points. As shown at the bottom of the table, the desire to change the way locally provided education is financed in Massachusetts also contributed to the favorable vote, but once again the impacts are relatively small. Although not shown explicitly in the table, the desire to shift the financing of special education services to the state contributed essentially nothing to the statewide vote for Proposition 2 1/2.

---

[1] The statewide actual favorable vote was 59 percent. The 58 percent used in the text is the favorable vote in the sample which represents an estimate of the statewide favorable vote of household heads.

Finally, Table III shows that concern about service or spending cutbacks contributed 11.7 percentage points to the vote against Proposition 2 1/2. This finding is consistent with the view that the campaign to educate voters about the possible cuts in education services that would accompany Proposition 2 1/2 had some effect. Importantly, the negative impact on the vote of those who opposed service or spending reductions outweighed the positive impact of those who wanted them.[1]

Summarizing these results, it appears that the education-related favorable vote for Proposition 2 1/2 is not, on net, a vote for reductions in school spending or service levels. Instead, the favorable vote reflects expectations of more voter control over school spending and, to a limited extent, the desire for changes in the way education is financed in Massachusetts.

The model explaining the vote on Question 3 is conceptually similar to that estimated for Proposition 2 1/2, but is based on a substantially smaller subsample and, because the goals of the two tax limitation measures differed, contains different variables measuring expected outcomes.[2] The smaller sample primarily reflects the fact that only a subset of all respondents were asked what they thought would have happened to taxes and services if the measure had passed. The estimated equation contains 32 variables and is based on the 315 voters for whom full information was available.[3]

---

[1] This is interesting in light of preliminary findings that education budgets were cut back proportionately more than other budgets during the first year under the proposition. See Katherine L. Bradbury and Helen F. Ladd, with Claire Christopherson, "Proposition 2 1/2: Initial Impacts."

[2] Because Question 3 would have limited the growth of state and local taxes rather than actually reducing them, detailed information on expected cutbacks in specific services or on expected increases in efficiency was not collected. Likewise, because the measure did not restrict the power of local school committees, respondents were not asked how Question 3 would affect voter control.

[3] For the complete Question 3 voting model, see Appendix A. The characteristics of the subsample on which the model is based are described in Appendix C of Ladd and Wilson, "Proposition 2 1/2: Explaining the Vote."

The full Question 3 model includes seven education-related variables. Although the equation explains the vote relatively well, many of the variables are statistically insignificant.[1] Of these seven education-related variables, only one--the expectation that Question 3 would have led to more school spending--is statistically significant. The coefficient of this variable implies that those who expected Question 3 to lead to more school spending were 19 percentage points more likely to vote "yes" than those who did not expect this outcome. Additional evidence that supporters of Question 3 viewed the measure as a way of expanding, rather than limiting, the resources available to local public schools is based on a relatively large but statistically insignificant coefficient that people preferring cuts in education spending were more likely than others to vote against the measure.

The following expectations variables all enter the Question 3 voting model with large positive and statistically significant coefficients: the expectation of state tax reform, of slower growth in property taxes, and slower growth in total taxes and spending. Thus, the conclusion emerges that supporters of Question 3 were in favor of slower growth of property and total taxes while at the same time they favored increased education spending.

Finally, the equation shows that even after controlling for their preferences and expectations, local public sector employees were substantially more likely than private sector employees to support Question 3. Similarly, the equation suggests that voters with a household member employed in local public schools were more likely than private sector employees to support Question 3. The statistical insignificance of this result should not be taken too seriously; only

---

[1] Using a cutoff probability of 0.5, the equation correctly predicts the vote of 80.2 percent of the sample. This compares to the 53 percent $[(0.36)^2 + (0.64)^2]$ that would have been correctly predicted by chance or to the 64 percent that would have been correctly predicted had a no vote been predicted for everyone.

Table IV

PREFERENCES FOR FIVE EDUCATION SERVICES[a]
All Respondents

Service Type	Percent of all respondents who want to: Decrease the service[b]	Maintain the service at current level	Increase the service[c]
Public Elementary and High School Education	17.1%	44.3%	38.6%
After School Programs	22.8	46.2	31.0
Special Education	11.1	34.0	54.9
Adult Education	18.0	54.4	27.5
State and Community Colleges and Universities	17.1	54.1	28.2

[a] Based on the question: "Think about the services provided by the state or local government to residents of your town or city. For each service I read, please tell me whether state or local government should be providing a lot less, a little less, the same amount, a little more, or a lot more of this service. Remember, if government provides less services state or local taxes will be reduced, and if government provides more services, state or local taxes will be increased. If the service is not available to residents in your city or town, please let me know. Let's begin with ("X'd ITEM). Which phrase in the first list describes how much more or less ("X'd" ITEM) state or local government should provide?"

[b] Includes those who want to decrease services "a little" and "a lot."

[c] Includes those who want to increase services services "a little" and "a lot."

education to 23 percent for after school programs. Because these percentages are so low, we begin our disaggregate analysis by looking at variations in the proportions wanting to increase services. These proportions range from 28 percent for adult education to 55 percent for special education.

Table V shows that the proportions of respondents wanting more education services vary across the subgroups in most of the demographic categories examined. Women were substantially more likely than men, and non-whites more likely than whites, to want higher levels of each of the five services. In contrast, the differences by religion are much smaller and less consistent across service types. In particular, the evidence does not support the hypothesis that the availability of Catholic private schools makes Catholics less supportive than non-Catholics of public education.

A clear pattern emerges by stage in life-cycle. In general, older households with no school-age children were less likely than younger households to want more education services. In particular, less than a third of the older households with no children or of the elderly wanted more of any service other than special education. Interestingly, greatest support for particular services came from the households that were likely to use the service in the near future; households with pre-school children were the most likely to want more public education, after-school programs and special education, and those with children between 6 and 17 were most likely to want more publicly supported higher education.

Overlapping the stage in life-cycle categories are the service usage categories. As expected, those who report that members of their household use the service were more likely than non-users to support increases. The relative narrowness of some of these differences can be explained in part by the life-cycle findings: "non-users" include many households who will use the service in the future.

Table V

PREFERENCES FOR INCREASES IN FIVE EDUCATION SERVICES[a,b]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Percent of respondents in each category who want to increase:				
	Public Elementary and Secondary Education	After School Programs	Special Education	Adult Education	Public Colleges
Total	38.6%	31.0%	54.9%	27.5%	28.2%
Sex					
Female	44.6	36.4	57.5	30.2	31.6
Male	32.5	25.6	52.3	24.8	24.9
Race					
Non-white	54.7	46.8	66.7	35.4	41.1
White	37.5	30.0	54.2	27.0	27.3
Religion					
Catholic	39.4	30.9	58.3	28.8	28.8
Jewish	36.4	32.2	53.4	18.0	26.4
Protestant	36.4	33.0	51.0	28.5	28.4
Other, no religion	40.5	27.6	51.8	25.3	26.6
Stage in Life Cycle					
Young, no children	44.2	36.9	64.5	36.5	32.9
Children present, oldest <6	48.0	38.5	66.7	27.7	27.9
Children present, oldest 6-17	40.3	30.7	49.6	24.5	30.6
Older adults, no children	31.5	27.6	50.2	25.2	24.9
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	28.2	21.9	50.7	24.7	20.3
Service Usage					
Use this service	41.6	32.4	61.1	32.9	34.2
Do not use this service	37.0	30.6	54.3	26.1	26.5

Table V (continued)

PREFERENCES FOR INCREASES IN FIVE EDUCATION SERVICES[a,b]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Percent of respondents in each category who want to increase:				
	Public Elementary and Secondary Education	After School Programs	Special Education	Adult Education	Public Colleges
Education					
Less than high school	48.1%	40.5%	65.6%	31.5%	37.6%
High school degree	39.9	30.0	59.7	30.5	28.7
Some college	36.2	30.9	50.3	26.9	27.4
College degree	35.2	27.1	49.4	23.6	24.7
Graduate school	33.9	30.1	47.4	22.3	24.0
Household Income					
Less than $10,000	50.3	43.6	71.2	37.6	35.2
$10,000 to <$20,000	41.0	34.8	60.9	28.3	30.6
$20,000 to <$30,000	38.0	26.7	50.3	27.6	26.6
$30,000 to <$50,000	30.8	25.4	45.9	22.8	24.5
$50,000 or more	30.9	29.2	43.3	23.1	14.5
Occupation of Household Head					
Professional	36.9	30.1	50.7	26.2	24.7
Managerial	34.4	26.6	47.6	21.3	24.1
Clerical, sales	36.2	32.1	56.1	28.6	33.9
Blue collar	40.7	29.7	59.4	29.7	29.3
Service	50.5	42.7	69.5	33.6	32.0
Not reported	39.8	36.3	56.2	31.0	32.7
Government Employee					
Educational employee	49.5	37.2	48.9	22.4	34.8
Local government employee	45.4	37.8	53.8	28.3	26.7
State government employee[c]	42.9	38.9	59.3	29.1	35.7
Federal government employee	40.3	27.0	62.5	29.7	38.6
No local, state, or federal employees in household	36.8	29.7	54.9	27.6	27.5

Table V (continued)

PREFERENCES FOR INCREASES IN FIVE EDUCATION SERVICES[a,b]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Percent of respondents in each category who want to increase:				
	Public Elementary and Secondary Education	After School Programs	Special Education	Adult Education	Public Colleges
Local Tax Share					
Owners: Less than 75% of community avg.	31.1	25.3	52.9	23.1	25.3
Owners: 75% to <100% of community avg.	34.7	25.5	43.0	18.7	24.7
Owners: 100% to <125% of community avg.	30.9	24.0	46.8	26.3	24.6
Owners: 125% or more of community avg.	25.6	20.3	39.2	16.3	17.2
Owners: Taxes not reported	37.2	27.4	53.1	31.9	27.4
Renters: never owned, no plans to own	48.4	44.9	65.2	36.3	33.6
Renters: Ever owned	53.4	39.2	67.6	40.3	38.6
Renters: Plan to own	45.0	30.8	59.2	29.2	23.3
Neither rent nor own	27.9	34.9	67.4	16.3	23.2
Political Ideology					
Very conservative	35.4%	28.9%	56.1%	31.6%	23.1%
Fairly conservative	36.8	28.3	50.0	25.5	25.4
Middle of the road	34.7	27.8	53.0	23.6	25.8
Fairly liberal	43.8	36.5	60.2	31.2	35.9
Very liberal	56.4	51.0	67.6	40.8	44.4

[a]Based on the question: "Think about the services provided by the state or local government to residents of your town or city. For each service I read, please tell me whether state or local government should be providing a lot less, a little less, the same amount, a little more, or a lot more of this service. Remember, if government provides less services state or local taxes will be reduced, and if government provides more services, state or local taxes will be increased. If the service is not available to residents in your city or town, please let me know. Let's begin with ("X'd ITEM). Which phrase in the first list describes how much more or less ("X'd" ITEM) state or local government should provide?"

[b]Each entry is the percentage of respondents that think there should be a "lot more" or a "little more" of that particular service. Percentages are based on those responding to the question.

[c]"State government employee" includes county employees.

With only a few exceptions, support for higher levels of each service decreases both with the amount of education received by the respondent and with household income. In addition, households headed by managers are least likely and those from households headed by service workers are most likely to want higher education service levels.

Respondents from households having at least one member employed by a local public school are more likely than other households to want higher levels of elementary and secondary education. These respondents are no more likely than those from households having non-school state or local public employees, however, to want more of the other four education services. Interestingly, respondents living in households having a federal government employee have the highest probabilities of all groups of wanting more special education, adult education and publicly supported higher education.

The tax share findings are roughly consistent with the hypothesis that respondents with low tax shares are more likely than others to want higher service levels. Among homeowners, the percentage wanting higher service levels generally decreases with the household's share of the tax burden, but the differences are small and the patterns are not consistent. Renters, particularly those who have no immediate plans to purchase a home, were more likely than homeowners to want more of each service. Presumably, this group of renters believes that they pay little or no local property taxes.

Finally, those who describe themselves as liberals express greater preference than others for increasing education services. Somewhat surprisingly, conservatives are no less likely and, in the case of special education and adult education, are more likely than those claiming to be middle-of-the-roaders to want to increase education services.

Table VI looks at the other side of the coin, i.e., variations in desired cutbacks. In most cases, the patterns are the reverse of

Table VI

PREFERENCES FOR CUTTING BACK FIVE EDUCATION SERVICES[a,b]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Percent of respondents in each category who want to cut back:				
	Public Elementary and Secondary Education	After School Programs	Special Education	Adult Education	Public Colleges
Total	17.1%	22.8%	11.1%	18.0%	17.6%
Sex					
Female	12.6	19.5	6.9	12.8	13.8
Male	21.5	26.0	15.4	23.4	21.4
Race					
Non-white	15.8	17.0	6.4	15.6	10.5
White	17.2	23.1	11.4	18.2	18.2
Religion					
Catholic	15.6	21.4	10.1	18.5	18.3
Jewish	15.9	14.9	11.4	21.4	14.9
Protestant	17.3	23.8	11.2	13.8	16.0
Other, no religion	21.8	27.6	14.1	22.9	19.8
Stage in Life Cycle					
Young, no children	13.9	16.9	9.0	14.3	15.1
Children present, oldest <6	13.6	18.4	5.6	15.2	18.0
Children present, oldest 6-17	16.9	23.8	13.2	20.2	14.1
Older adults, no children	23.4	26.3	14.9	21.3	21.2
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	16.8	27.4	8.8	16.0	24.9
Service Usage					
Use this service	16.6	18.4	4.6	13.0	10.5
Do not use this service	17.4	23.8	11.7	19.4	19.6

VI (continued)

PREFERENCES FOR CUTTING BACK FIVE EDUCATION SERVICES[a,b]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Percent of respondents in each category who want to cut back:				
	Public Elementary and Secondary Education	After School Programs	Special Education	Adult Education	Public Colleges
Education					
Less than high school	15.4%	20.5%	6.7%	12.8%	14.2%
High School degree	18.2	22.3	6.4	17.6	17.8
Some college	17.7	25.1	11.4	18.5	15.5
College degree	16.4	22.9	17.0	19.2	21.5
Graduate school	16.4	22.0	19.1	22.3	18.9
Occupation of Household Head					
Professional	13.6	23.2	14.8	18.4	18.4
Managerial	24.8	24.2	16.2	24.7	18.3
Clerical, sales	16.0	19.2	10.0	13.8	17.2
Blue collar	17.6	24.8	7.9	16.7	17.4
Service	8.6	11.6	1.0	12.5	15.0
Not reported	16.8	25.0	9.3	16.8	18.0
Government Employee					
Educational employee	5.4	17.0	20.2	14.9	11.2
Local government employee	14.3	13.4	10.1	15.0	12.1
State government employee[c]	14.3	13.0	11.1	12.7	21.4
Federal government employee	25.8	30.2	10.9	31.3	17.5
No local, state, or federal employees in household	18.0	24.2	10.5	18.1	18.6
Household Income					
Less than $10,000	12.6	15.2	3.8	10.5	16.4
$10,000 to <$20,000	15.5	18.9	7.0	13.2	15.9
$20,000 to <$30,000	19.0	26.7	13.8	19.9	18.2
$30,000 to <$50,000	19.0	26.8	16.0	25.1	17.4
$50,000 or more	20.6	21.5	17.9	24.6	33.9

Table VI (continued)

PREFERENCES FOR CUTTING BACK FIVE EDUCATION SERVICES[a,b]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Percent of respondents in each category who want to increase:				
	Public Elementary and Secondary Education	After School Programs	Special Education	Adult Education	Public Colleges
Local Tax Share					
Owners: Less than 75% of community avg.	15.8%	25.1%	8.6%	16.4%	14.7%
Owners: 75% to <100% of community avg.	19.8	26.4	14.3	25.6	21.0
Owners: 100% to <125% of community avg.	20.0	24.7	17.2	21.5	24.1
Owners: ≥125% of community avg.	21.5	27.3	18.6	24.9	21.9
Owners: Taxes not reported	26.1	25.2	12.8	18.9	15.2
Renters: never owned, no plans to own	13.0	13.1	6.1	8.6	12.4
Renters: Ever owned	10.9	16.8	5.1	12.2	13.9
Renters: Plan to own	12.0	26.1	8.6	16.7	22.3
Neither rent nor own	14.6	22.5	0.0	12.2	7.5
Political Ideology					
Very conservative	20.8	28.1	12.9	23.3	29.2
Fairly conservative	20.6	28.8	16.0	23.7	18.8
Middle of the road	17.5	21.3	11.1	17.3	15.6
Fairly liberal	13.8	18.6	6.7	13.2	16.5
Very liberal	5.9	14.7	1.0	10.2	12.1

[a] Based on the question: "Think about the services provided by the state or local government to residents of your town or city. For each service I read, please tell me whether state or local government should be providing a lot less, a little less, the same amount, a little more, or a lot more of this service. Remember, if government provides less services state or local taxes will be reduced, and if government provides more services, state or local taxes will be increased. If the service is not available to residents in your city or town, please let me know. Let's begin with ("X'd ITEM). Which phrase in the first list describes how much more or less ("X'd" ITEM) state or local government should provide?"

[b] Each entry is the percentage of respondents that think there should be a "little less" or a "lot less" of that particular service. Percentages are based on those responding to the question.

[c] "State government employee" includes county employees.

of those for desired increases. Support for cutbacks is higher among respondents who are male, white, better educated or conservative than among those who are female, non-white, less well educated or liberal. In addition, support for cutbacks is higher among respondents whose households are older with no children, do not use the service, are headed by a managerial worker, have higher household income, and own their own home, compared with respondents who are young, use the service, whose household head is a service worker, have low incomes, or who rent.

Not surprisingly, only five percent of respondents in households with a worker in the local public schools wanted to reduce elementary and secondary education services. At the same time, however, 20 percent of these respondents--in contrast to 10 percent of other groups--wanted to reduce special education. As shown below, part of this difference in views about special education may reflect differing perceptions of how efficiently the services are provided. More generally, these findings indicate that at least some educational employees would like to reverse the recent trend of growth in special education services at the expense of regular education.

Spending Levels

This section looks at desired changes in spending for local public education, in contrast to desired changes in service levels. The next section then discusses respondents' perceptions of the link between spending and service levels.

Table VII shows that 44 percent of the respondents wanted to decrease school spending, 36 percent wanted to keep it the same, and 20 percent wanted to increase it. Thus, a relatively large proportion of Massachusetts household heads, including the "middle" or average respondent, was content with the pre-Proposition 2 1/2 level of school spending. At the same time, almost half the respondents wanted lower spending even though, as discussed above, a much smaller proportion wanted to reduce service levels.

Table VII

DESIRED CHANGES IN SPENDING AND TAXES FOR LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS[a,b]

By Demographic Characteristics

	Local School Spending Should		
	Increase	Stay the Same	Decrease
Total	20.0%	35.6%	44.4%
Sex			
Female	21.7	36.8	41.4
Male	18.4	34.3	47.3
Race			
Non-white	35.4	30.2	34.4
White	19.0	35.9	45.0
Religion			
Catholic	18.5	34.0	47.6
Jewish	23.9	40.2	35.9
Protestant	19.6	37.5	42.9
Other, no religion	24.1	35.4	40.5
Stage in Life Cycle			
Young, no children	34.4	38.1	27.6
Children present, oldest <6	25.6	35.6	38.9
Children present, oldest 6-17	19.7	36.2	44.2
Older adults, no children	11.0	33.7	55.2
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	8.3	33.2	58.5
Service Usage			
Children in public schools	20.4	35.0	44.7
No children in public schools	19.9	35.9	44.2
Education			
Less than high school	23.0	32.0	50.0
High School degree	16.9	35.1	48.0
Some college	20.6	36.3	43.1
College degree	20.6	37.4	42.1
Graduate school	25.0	38.3	36.7

Table VII (continued)

DESIRED CHANGES IN SPENDING AND TAXES FOR LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS[a,b]

By Demographic Characteristics

	Local School Spending Should		
	Increase	Stay the Same	Decrease
Household Income			
Less than $10,000	29.0%	37.9%	33.1%
$10,000 to <$20,000	23.8	32.4	43.8
$20,000 to <$30,000	18.2	33.4	48.4
$30,000 to <$50,000	12.0	41.9	46.2
$50,000 or more	21.7	33.3	44.9
Occupation of Household Head			
Professional	22.6	37.3	40.1
Managerial	14.8	35.0	50.2
Clerical, sales	15.5	41.5	43.0
Blue collar	21.6	31.0	47.5
Service	25.7	37.1	37.1
Not reported	21.5	36.2	42.3
Government Employee			
Educational employee	20.2	41.5	38.3
Local government employee	21.0	27.7	51.3
State government employee[c]	17.5	38.6	43.9
Federal government employee	15.4	36.9	47.7
No local, state, or federal employees in household	20.3	35.7	44.0
Local Tax Price			
Owners: Less than 75% of community avg.	16.0	33.3	47.6
Owners: 75% to <100% of community avg.	12.0	34.3	52.2
Owners: 100% to <125% of community avg.	10.9	36.6	52.6
Owners: 125% or more of community avg.	11.9	33.0	53.7
Owners: No taxes reported	17.7	35.4	46.0
Renters: Never owned, no plans to own	31.6	39.8	28.5
Renters: Ever owned	36.4	32.4	31.2
Renters: Plan to own	25.8	33.3	48.8
Neither rent nor own	16.3	46.5	37.2

Table VII (continued)

DESIRED CHANGES IN SPENDING AND TAXES FOR LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS[a,b]

By Demographic Characteristics

	Local School Spending Should		
	Increase	Stay the Same	Decrease
Political Ideology			
Very conservative	19.3%	30.4%	50.4%
Fairly conservative	15.8	30.8	53.5
Middle of the road	17.7	37.6	44.6
Fairly liberal	25.7	36.5	37.8
Very liberal	37.9	36.9	25.2

[a]Based on the question: "Compared to what the state government now spends, by what percentage, if any, would you like to see state government taxing and spending increase or decrease? You may answer any percent increase or decrease from 1% to 100% or tell me you want it to stay the same. And by what percentage, if any, would you like to see local government taxing and spending increase or decrease. And by what percentage, if any, would you like to see local public school taxes and spending increase or decrease?"

[b]Percentages are based on those responding to the question and total to 100% across rows.

[c]"State government employee" includes county employees.

At least half the respondents in each of the following groups wanted lower school spending:

- older households with no children, including the elderly;
- respondents with less than a high school degree;
- households headed by someone in a managerial position;
- households with a local government employee;
- households with local tax shares greater than 75 percent of the community average; and
- respondents who are "fairly" or "very" conservative.

The findings confirm that stage in life-cycle is an important determinant of opposition to public school spending, with young childless households providing the least opposition and older households the most. In addition, respondents in households including local school employees are less likely than those in households with or without other public sector employees to want less school spending. This could reflect either above-average preferences for school spending among this group or concern that their household incomes would be adversely affected by spending reductions. Concern about public sector jobs may also account for the large fraction of non-school local public sector employees who want spending reductions; cutbacks in school spending may allow local government to maintain non-school spending and jobs at current levels.

Perceptions of Inefficiency

Respondents' perceptions of inefficiency can partially reconcile their apparently inconsistent desires to reduce spending but not service levels. We measure these perceptions as the percentage by which respondents believe spending can be reduced without appreciable reductions in service levels. Table VIII reports the results in summary form. The first number in each entry indicates the percentage of respondents who believe that spending cuts of less than five percent would significantly affect service levels. The larger this number, the greater the proportion of respondents who believe the service is provided efficiently. The second number in each entry represents the percentage of respondents who believe that spending

Table VIII

BELIEFS THAT SPENDING CAN BE CUT WITHOUT AFFECTING THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF VARIOUS EDUCATION SERVICES: POSSIBLE CUTBACKS OF LESS THAN 5 PERCENT/ POSSIBLE CUTBACKS OF 15 PERCENT OR MORE[a,b]

By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary and Secondary Education <5%/≥15%	After School Programs <5%/≥15%	Special Education <5%/≥15%	Adult Education <5%/≥15%	Public Colleges <5%/≥15%
Total	38%/37%	42%/34%	58%/22%	31%/45%	35%/40%
Sex					
Female	41/36	42/36	58/22	32/46	35/41
Male	36/39	42/33	57/21	31/43	34/40
Race					
Non-white	41/35	39/39	60/22	34/45	35/33
White	38/38	42/34	58/22	31/45	35/41
Religion					
Catholic	36/39	40/36	56/22	27/48	31/44
Jewish	45/29	43/31	60/16	27/45	39/33
Protestant	42/35	46/28	59/22	38/38	38/37
Other, no religion	38/40	42/40	60/23	34/46	39/37
Stage in Life Cycle					
Young, no children	43/33	44/33	61/20	34/38	36/38
Children present, oldest <6	41/34	40/37	63/18	29/46	27/43
Children present, oldest 6-17	38/37	40/31	56/21	29/46	35/40
Older adults, no children	33/46	43/39	52/27	30/46	36/40
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	39/37	45/35	63/21	37/47	37/45
Service Usage					
Use this service	38/37	45/26	67/17	39/39	41/36
Do not use this service	39/38	41/36	57/22	29/16	33/42
Education					
Less than high school	42/39	39/37	58/26	29/47	34/46
High School degree	36/41	36/39	58/21	27/49	32/44
Some college	36/45	46/34	58/21	32/44	36/37
College degree	42/35	46/27	57/21	35/40	36/37
Graduate school	42/32	48/31	59/23	38/37	38/37

Table VIII (continued)

BELIEFS THAT SPENDING CAN BE CUT WITHOUT AFFECTING THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF VARIOUS EDUCATION SERVICES: (continued)

By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary and Secondary Education <5%/≥15%	After School Programs <5%/≥15%	Special Education <5%/≥15%	Adult Education <5%/≥15%	Public Colleges <5%/≥15%
Household Income					
Less than $10,000	46/35%	43/39%	61/24%	37/43%	41/43%
$10,000 to <$20,000	37/38	41/34	60/19	30/46	33/42
$20,000 to <$30,000	37/39	42/35	57/23	28/46	33/42
$30,000 to <$50,000	39/38	44/31	57/22	34/43	37/38
$50,000 or more	32/43	34/40	41/32	30/46	28/43
Occupation of Household Head					
Professional	38%/35%	46%/32%	56%/23%	31%/42%	34%/37%
Managerial	34/38	44/31	57/22	34/42	34/40
Clerical, sales	41/36	41/32	57/22	34/42	38/35
Blue collar	40/38	39/38	63/19	30/46	36/44
Service	41/39	35/40	52/24	26/53	32/48
Not reported	37/40	43/36	57/24	31/49	34/44
Government Employee					
Educational employee	48/31	51/28	56/27	33/45	40/35
Local government employee	35/45	45/34	59/24	33/46	33/39
State government employee[c]	46/39	57/18	67/19	37/44	51/44
Federal government employee	45/36	38/37	66/19	29/48	38/42
No local, state, or federal employees in household	37/37	41/35	57/22	31/44	34/41
Local Tax Price					
Owners: Less than 75% of community avg.	40/31	40/29	60/16	26/47	36/37
Owners: 75% to <100% of community avg.	34/39	39/32	56/23	31/45	29/41
Owners: 100% to <125% of community avg.	33/42	43/34	51/25	30/42	31/45
Owners: 125% or more of community avg.	30/43	41/35	48/25	30/44	31/39
Owners: Taxes not reported	35/35	36/35	58/17	32/42	39/34

Table VIII (continued)

BELIEFS THAT SPENDING CAN BE CUT WITHOUT AFFECTING THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF VARIOUS EDUCATION SERVICES: (continued)

By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary and Secondary Education <5%/≥15%	After School Programs <5%/≥15%	Special Education <5%/≥15%	Adult Education <5%/≥15%	Public Colleges <5%/≥15%
Local Tax Price (continued)					
Renters: never owned, no plans to own	47%/31%	43%/30%	57%/21%	33%/41%	36%/37%
Renters: Ever owned	39/35	41/34	60/21	27/43	34/39
Renters: Plan to own	37/43	38/45	58/22	31/43	32/41
Neither rent nor own	49/28	51/28	67/14	53/33	42/28
Political Ideology					
Very conservative	35/44	35/47	49/30	29/48	27/50
Fairly conservative	34/43	38/40	53/27	31/48	33/44
Middle of the road	37/37	42/31	58/21	29/44	34/38
Fairly liberal	43/31	48/28	64/16	35/39	37/39
Very liberal	51/25	51/29	69/13	36/43	47/29

[a] Based on the questions: "By what percentage, if any, do you think government could cut back spending on _____ without significantly affecting the quality or amount of service provided?" And by what percentage, if any, do you think state government could cut taxes and spending without significantly cutting the amount of services? Overall, by what percentage, if any, do you think your local government could cut taxes and spending without significantly cutting the amount of services?"

[b] Each entry has two numbers. The number to the left of the slash is the percentage of respondents who believe that spending cuts of 5% or more would significantly affect the quality or amount of service provided. The number to the right of the slash is the percentage of respondents who believe spending for that service could be cut by 15% or more without significantly affecting the quality or amount of service provided. Percentages are based on those responding to the question. NA means that the question was not asked.

[c] "State government employee" includes county employees.

could be cut by 15 percent or more without reducing service levels. Hence, the larger this second number, the greater the proportion of respondents who perceive extensive inefficiency and waste.[1]

Previous analysis has shown that respondents perceived less inefficiency and waste in the provision of education services than in the provision of overall local or overall state services.[2] Despite this, at least one in three respondents thought spending on four of the five education services could be reduced by 15 percent or more without affecting services. In the case of special education, only one in five (22 percent) held this view, while six in ten (58 percent) believed spending cuts of five percent or more would reduce service levels.

The clearest pattern emerges with respect to political ideology. Those who are conservative are consistently more likely than those who are liberal to perceive inefficiency and waste, and in many cases the differences are large. Forty-four percent of those who say they are "very" conservative, in contrast to 25 percent of those who say they are "very" liberal, thought spending on elementary and secondary education could be cut by 15 percent or more without service reductions.

Not surprisingly, respondents in households with a worker in the local public school are the least likely to perceive inefficiency in school operations. These respondents are more likely than other groups, however, to perceive inefficiency in the provision of special education. This provides additional evidence of the conflict between regular and special education. A similar conflict appears between

---

[1]This measure of perceived inefficiency is flawed to the extent that respondents who wanted to shift to private provision or more user charge financing of a publicly provided service reported that they believed spending could be cut without service cuts. This limitation should be kept in mind when interpreting the results for adult education and public colleges.

[2]See Ladd and Wilson, "Proposition 2 1/2: Explaining the Vote."

school and non-school local government operations; respondents in households with a municipal employee are much more likely than all other groups to believe that local public schools are inefficiently run.

Patterns across the other demographic categories are suggestive though not always consistent across service types. To summarize, more than two out of five respondents in each of the following groups believes that spending in elementary and secondary schools can be cut back by 15 percent or more without service reductions:

- non-elderly older households with no children;
- respondents with some college education;
- households with a non-school local government employee;
- households with income greater than $50,000; and
- respondents who consider themselves "fairly" or "very" conservative.

These are therefore the groups most commonly disenchanted with the operation of local public schools.

Education Finance

As noted in Section I, elementary and secondary education is financed heavily by local property taxes in Massachusetts while state and community colleges are financed primarily by state taxes and tuitions. In this section we examine how respondents would like to alter these financing arrangements. The findings are based on responses to a question about whether respondents wanted to continue the current financing arrangement for each education service or whether they wanted to see a greater share of the money come from local property taxes, state income taxes, state sales taxes, user fees or some other source.[1]

Table IX shows that preferences for changes in financing arrangements differ across the five education services. More than three-quarters of the respondents wanted to change the way public elementary and secondary education is financed in the state, but

[1] Respondents were not told what proportion of any of the services was currently financed with property taxes.

Table IX

PREFERENCES FOR SHIFTING MORE OF THE FINANCING OF VARIOUS EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO LOCAL OR STATE TAXES OR USER FEES[a,b,c]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary & Secondary Educ.			After School Programs			Special Education			Adult Education			Public Colleges		
	Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:		
	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees
Total	34%	36%	7%	39%	19%	20%	15%	60%	6%	20%	27%	32%	3%	58%	21%
Sex															
Female	32	38	7	39	18	23	15	60	6	21	25	31	5	58	19
Male	36	36	7	39	21	18	15	62	6	20	27	33	2	58	22
Race															
Non-white	26	41	3	29	30	15	18	51	8	18	31	16	5	61	16
White	36	37	7	40	19	21	15	61	6	20	26	33	3	58	21
Religion															
Catholic	36	36	7	42	21	19	15	62	5	23	26	31	4	59	20
Jewish	33	39	5	34	18	20	16	62	3	19	23	42	4	61	18
Protestant	32	37	7	40	16	21	17	55	7	20	26	31	4	56	20
Other, no religion	31	40	9	32	21	24	11	66	7	14	28	36	1	57	24
Stage in Life Cycle															
Young, no children	34	46	5	35	24	20	11	69	6	20	26	39	4	60	19
Children present, oldest <6	35	36	8	39	22	23	24	55	4	18	29	30	3	54	29
Children present, oldest 6-17	36	34	7	42	16	21	15	60	6	22	23	35	3	57	22
Older adults, no children	31	38	11	36	21	21	13	62	7	18	29	30	2	61	19
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	34	29	6	42	16	18	17	55	6	23	28	21	4	58	16

Table IX (continued)

PREFERENCES FOR SHIFTING MORE OF THE FINANCING OF VARIOUS EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO LOCAL OR STATE TAXES OR USER FEES[a,b,c]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary & Secondary Educ.			After School Programs			Special Education			Adult Education			Public Colleges		
	Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:		
	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees
Service Usage															
Use this service	37%	35%	6%	43%	19%	6%	18%	63%	2%	20%	27%	30%	2%	66%	18%
Do not use this service	33	38	8	38	20	6	15	60	6	21	26	33	4	56	22
Education															
Less than high school	29	50	3	26	33	16	15	61	5	21	35	22	5	57	17
High School degree	33	36	8	41	20	20	19	57	5	20	29	31	4	56	22
Some college	37	34	7	43	15	20	14	61	7	19	23	36	2	58	23
College degree	38	36	8	44	15	23	14	62	6	23	21	37	4	61	20
Graduate school	34	35	8	32	17	22	18	64	7	17	24	33	2	60	18
Occupation of Household Head															
Professional	32	36	7	37	19	22	12	61	7	19	23	34	3	62	18
Managerial	37	34	10	42	15	26	19	57	8	23	19	41	2	58	24
Clerical, sales	30	37	7	36	21	22	12	59	6	17	28	32	3	58	21
Blue collar	38	37	6	41	22	17	18	63	3	20	31	28	4	57	21
Service	21	47	9	44	19	18	14	59	9	25	30	28	8	55	15
Not reported	36	36	6	37	23	16	12	62	6	19	29	27	3	54	22
Government Employee															
Educational employee	26	41	9	36	23	20	12	56	7	25	22	31	2	64	14
Local government employee	37	37	7	46	16	17	20	56	4	26	19	33	3	55	22
State government employee[d]	23	46	7	33	21	23	5	72	4	20	36	42	5	59	20
Federal government employee	28	44	12	29	22	27	15	57	12	17	23	35	2	61	25
No local, state, or federal employees in household	35	36	7	40	19	20	16	61	6	20	27	32	4	58	21

Table IX (continued)

PREFERENCES FOR SHIFTING MORE OF THE FINANCING OF VARIOUS EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO LOCAL OR STATE TAXES OR USER FEES[a,b,c]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary & Secondary Educ.			After School Programs			Special Education			Adult Education			Public Colleges		
	Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:		
	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees
Household Income															
Less than $10,000	33%	40%	4%	32%	30%	18%	14%	60%	7%	22%	30%	29%	5%	58%	18%
$10,000 to <$20,000	31	39	6	38	21	17	15	60	5	18	30	29	4	58	18
$20,000 to <$30,000	33	38	8	42	17	20	13	65	5	19	24	33	3	55	23
$30,000 to <$50,000	41	31	10	41	15	26	18	57	7	23	22	37	3	61	23
$50,000 or more	34	35	7	40	16	28	17	52	12	19	21	39	2	62	26
Local Tax Share															
Owners: Less than 75% of community avg.	31	39	4	39	15	19	15	57	5	16	26	32	3	54	18
Owners: 75% to <100% of community avg.	39	28	8	45	13	21	15	61	4	20	21	36	3	56	22
Owners: 100% to <125% of community avg.	37	36	8	37	15	24	17	57	3	25	24	26	2	60	21
Owners: 125% or more of community avg.	27	35	9	41	11	24	15	52	9	23	22	33	2	54	26
Owners: Taxes not reported	37	35	4	34	22	21	18	63	3	19	30	29	2	58	18

Table IX (continued)

PREFERENCES FOR SHIFTING MORE OF THE FINANCING OF VARIOUS EDUCTIONAL SERVICES TO LOCAL OR STATE TAXES OR USER FEES[a,b,c]
By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary & Secondary Educ.			After School Programs			Special Education			Adult Education			Public Colleges		
	Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:			Shift more to:		
	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Local Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees
Local Tax Share (continued)															
Renters: never owned, no plans to own	30%	45%	6%	32%	30%	18%	15%	61%	7%	17%	31%	30%	6%	56%	15%
Renters: Ever owned	35	38	7	39	25	15	12	67	5	21	25	36	3	67	17
Renters: Plan to own	32	24	11	37	32	20	13	50	9	15	30	28	6	43	23
Neither rent nor own	44	40	5	42	21	16	9	65	7	26	25	33	2	63	23
Political Ideology															
Very conservative	33	35	6	35	18	24	11	63	9	17	26	34	3	55	27
Fairly conservative	34	38	9	37	23	20	14	59	6	22	28	31	3	60	20
Middle of the road	36	36	6	43	18	20	16	60	6	21	25	32	3	57	21
Fairly liberal	35	36	8	40	16	21	15	63	4	20	22	38	4	55	22
Very liberal	25	49	8	31	26	16	18	63	5	15	37	24	3	65	12

[a]Based on the question: "For each service I read, would you like to keep the financing the way it now is or to see a greater share of the money come from local property taxes, from state income taxes, from state sales taxes, or a greater share from fees paid by users of the service?"

[b]Percentages are calculated for respondents who answered each question.

[c]State taxes include income taxes and sales taxes.

[d]"State government employee" includes county employees.

surprisingly, only a third (36 percent) wanted to increase the share financed by state taxes while another third wanted to increase reliance on the local property tax. Strongest support for increased state financing came from those with less than high school education, heads of young households with no children, non-whites, low income households, renters who have never owned and have no immediate plans to own, and those who describe themselves as very liberal. Surprisingly, homeowners on average were less likely than renters to prefer more reliance on state taxes. Strongest support for increasing the property tax share of public school finance came from Catholics, whites, and both managerial and blue-collar households.

With respect to the financing of after school programs, four in ten respondents wanted to rely more heavily on local property taxes, two in ten wanted to shift some of the burden to state taxes, and another two in ten want to increase reliance on user fees. Respondents with less than a high school degree, non-whites, and renters--especially those who have never owned and have no immediate plans to own--are more likely than others to prefer a higher state share. Whites, women, respondents in pink- and white-collar households, in households with above average local tax shares and incomes above $30,000, and those who describe themselves as very conservative are more likely than others to prefer a shift to user fees.

Six in ten respondents want to increase the state share of special education financing. Support for state financing of special education is similarly high across all groups, although it increases as the respondents' education increases, and is greater among whites than non-whites and among respondents in young households with no children than in other household types.

Three in ten respondents wanted to increase the users' share of financing for adult education. The strength of this preference increases with the respondents' education and household income. It is weakest among the elderly, non-whites, managerial households, and

those who describe themselves as very liberal. One in four respondents wanted to increase the state share of financing for adult education. Interest in this type of change exhibits the opposite pattern across income and education groups than that for user charges; the less educated and the poor are more likely than others to want a larger state share. Support for this change is weakest among whites and professional and managerial households.

Nearly six in ten respondents wanted to increase the state share of financing for public higher education while two in ten wanted to increase tuitions and fees. Support for increasing the state share came equally from all groups. Support for increasing tuitions and fees was greatest among young household heads with pre-school children, high income households, and those who describe themselves as very conservative.

IV. CONCLUSION

Respondents' views on education-related issues help to explain the voting outcomes on Proposition 2 1/2, which requires dramatic reductions in property taxes, and on Question 3, which would have required increased state aid for education. The passage of the former and the defeat of the latter should not be interpreted as evidence that Massachusetts voters were rebelling against education services and spending. Instead, household heads appear to have been more concerned with the process by which education spending is determined. As shown in Section II, education views contributed on net about 7 percentage points to the statewide favorable vote on Proposition 2 1/2. Perceptions of inefficiency and expectations that the measure would lead to greater control by voters over school spending contributed much more to the favorable vote than preferences for lower service or spending levels.

Section III showed that the typical Massachusetts household head was relatively satisfied with the level of public education services and the way they were provided at the time of the tax limitation vote.

At the same time, however, there was more disenchantment with some aspects of local public schools than others and certain categories of residents were less satisfied than others. Recognition of these differences is important for public officials in Massachusetts responding to Proposition 2 1/2 and for policy makers in other states grappling with the problem of allocating scarce resources between education and other public services, and among categories of education spending.

REFERENCES

Bradbury, Katharine L., and Helen F. Ladd, with Claire Christopherson. "Proposition 2 1/2: Initial Impacts," forthcoming in New England Economic Review and as a Policy Paper of the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford, California.

Economic Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1981.

Holland, Daniel and Oliver Oldman. "Estimating the Impact of 100% of Market Value Property Tax Assessment of Boston Real Estate." Boston Urban Observatory, 1974.

Kish, Leslie. Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Ladd, Helen F. and Julie Boatright Wilson. "Proposition 2 1/2: Explaining the Vote," in Tax Limitations in Massachusetts, prepared for the National Institute of Education, January 1982. Also available as John F. Kennedy School of Government, Program in City and Regional Planning, Research Report R81-1.

_____, "Who Supports Tax Limitations: Evidence from Massachusetts' Proposition 2 1/2," in Tax Limitations in Massachusetts, prepared for the National Institute of Education, January 1982. Also available as John F. Kennedy School of Government, Program in City and Regional Planning, Discussion Paper D82-3.

_____, "Why Voters Support Tax Limitations: Evidence from Massachusetts' Proposition 2 1/2," in Tax Limitations in Massachusetts, prepared for the National Institute of Education, January 1982. Also available as John F. Kennedy School of Government, Program in City and Regional Planning, Discussion Paper D82-4.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSITION 2 1/2 AND QUESTION 3 VOTING MODELS

Table A-I

PROPOSITION 2 1/2 VOTING MODEL[a]

Estimated Coefficients and t Values

Variable	Form[b]	Coefficient	t Statistic
Intercept		0.007	0.06
Preferences For Service Levels[c]			
Education & Recreation[d]	Linear (1-5)	-0.040	-2.01
Public Safety[e]	Linear (1-5)	-0.027	-1.57
Sanitation & Street Repair[f]	Linear (1-5)	-0.004	-0.22
Human Services[g]	Linear (1-5)	0.024	1.39
Welfare[h]	Linear (1-5)	-0.023	-2.10
Expected Service Levels[i]			
Education & Recreation[d]	Ln (1-5)	0.151	3.02
Public Safety[e]	Ln (1-5)	0.124	2.98
Sanitation & Street Repair[f]	Ln (1-5)	0.041	1.01
Human Services[g]	Ln (1-5)	0.119	2.64
Welfare[h]	Linear (1-5)	-0.043	-3.12
Total community services	Ln (1-5)	0.124	3.81
Services used by household	Ln (1-5)	0.031	0.82
Perception of Inefficiency in:[j]			
Local government	0-1	-0.002	-0.05
State government	0-1	0.039	1.03
Local schools	0-1	0.050	2.01
Welfare spending	0-1	0.018	0.58
Attitudes about Inefficiency			
Local government employees are overpaid and do not work hard[k]	linear (1-4)	0.057	4.23
Expected Efficiency Gains[i]			
More efficiency in local government	0-1	0.129	4.89
More efficient, responsible or less corrupt government[l]	0-1	0.096	0.021
More local voter control over school spending	0-1	0.129	0.090

Table A-I (continued)

PROPOSITION 2 1/2 VOTING MODEL[a]

Estimated Coefficients and t Values

Variable	Form[b]	Coefficient	t Statistic
Preferences for Lower Spending and Taxes[m]			
State government	0-1	0.028	1.13
Local government	0-1	0.021	0.83
Local schools	0-1	0.049	1.96
Expected Changes in Spending and Taxes[i]			
Decrease in school funds	0-1	-0.060	-2.55
Lower property taxes	0-1	0.131	4.50
Higher state taxes	0-1	-0.079	-2.93
Lower household taxes	Ln (1-5)	-0.112	-4.14
Preferences for Shifting Method of Finance			
Shift of education to state taxes[n]	0-1	0.047	1.93
Shift of special education to state taxes[o]	0-1	0.009	0.39
Shift of other local services to state taxes[p]	Linear (0-1)	-0.019	-0.46
Shift of certain services to user charges[q]	Linear (0-1)	0.053	1.53
Attitudes Toward Taxes			
State should give more aid to reduce property taxes	0-1	-0.013	-0.51
Support for redistributive taxes and aid[r]	Linear (1-4)	-0.025	-1.83
Expected Changes in Taxes[i]			
Tax reform	0-1	0.057	1.96
More state aid	0-1	0.024	1.10

Table A-I (continued)

PROPOSITION 2 1/2 VOTING MODEL[a]

Estimated Coefficients and t Values

Variable	Form[b]	Coefficient	t Statistic
Perception of Fiscal Position of Other Groups Relative to that of Respondent's Household[s]			
Business firms are better off today	0-1	-0.030	1.34
Business firms have done better over the past two years	0-1	0.041	1.77
Poor households are better off today	0-1	0.015	0.56
Poor households have done better over the past two years	0-1	0.071	2.18
Minority households are better off today	0-1	0.035	1.27
Minority households have done better over the past two years	0-1	-0.055	-1.88
Household Member Employed By Public Sector			
Local schools	0-1	-0.076	-1.30
Local government	0-1	-0.121	-3.06
State government	0-1	-0.072	-1.69

[a] Based on 1,114 respondents for whom complete information was available. Estimated using ordinary least squares. The dependent variable takes on the value of 1 for a "yes" vote. The R^2 is .54. The equation correctly predicts the vote of 85% of the respondents.

[b] Variables enter the equation in three forms--linear, log, and dummy. Linear and log variables are scaled from one to five or one to four. Responses ranging from one to five are based on the following scale: "A lot less" = 1, "a little less" = 2, "the same" = 3, "a little more" = 4, "a lot more" = 5. Responses ranging from one to four are based on the following scale: "disagree a lot" = 1, "disagree a little" = 2, "agree a little" = 3, "agree a lot" = 4. Unless otherwise indicated, dummy variables are scored in the following manner: 1 = "agree a lot" or "agree a little" with the statement. All other responses = 0.

Table A-I (continued)

[c] Items in each group were clustered using factor analytic techniques. For a more detailed discussion of this see Helen F. Ladd and Julie Boatright Wilson, "Why Voters support Tax Limitations: Evidence from Massachusetts' Proposition 2 1/2."

[d] Includes "public elementary and high school education," "adult education," "local public parks and recreation facilities," and "after school programs for students, such as music and athletics."

[e] Includes "fire fighting services" and "police services".

[f] Includes "regular garbage pick-up" and "street and sidewalk repairs."

[g] Includes "special education for children with learning problems," "mental health programs," and "services for the elderly."

[h] "Welfare or other public assistance programs."

[i] All expectation variables are respondent's belief that certain outcomes will occur as a result of Proposition 2 1/2.

[j] Belief that spending in these areas could be reduced by 15 percent or more without significantly reducing the quality or quantity of services.

[k] Cluster of two attitude items: "City or town employees are overpaid" and "City or town employees don't work as hard as people who work for private companies." Respondents' scores on these two items are added and divided by two. Scores range from one to four.

[l] Open-ended response to: "Overall, what do you think will be the single most important change caused by the passage of Proposition 2 1/2?"

[m] Prefer to reduce spending and taxes by five percent or more.

[n] Scored 1 if respondent wants more state (sales or income tax) financing of elementary and secondary education, and 0 otherwise.

[o] Scored 1 if respondent wants more state (sales or income tax) financing of special education, and 0 otherwise.

[p] Sum of responses indicating a desired shift to state income or sales taxes for police, parks, or after-school programs, divided by the number of these services for which an answer was given. (Range is 0 to 1.)

[q] Sum of responses indicating a desired shift to user charges for local transportation, adult education, and after school programs, divided by the number of these services for which an answer was given. (Range is 0 to 1.)

[r] Cluster of two attitude items: "A graduated income tax is the best way for the state to raise money," and "Taxpayers in rich cities and towns should help pay for services in poorer cities and towns." Respondents' scores on these two items are summed and divided by two. Scores range from one to four.

Table A-I (continued)

[s]Based on two questions: "Sometimes it seems that certain groups of people pay a lot in taxes but don't get very many services while others don't pay much in taxes but get a lot of services. Using the phrases in list one, please tell me whether ____ get a lot less than they pay for, a little less, the same amount as they pay for, a little more, or a lot more than they pay for"; and "Now we'd like you to think about two years ago. Taking into account services they get for the taxes they pay are ____ better off, worse off or about the same now as they were two years ago?". Respondents' scores for their own household are compared to their scores for business and industry, poor families and minority groups. A score of 1 is given if the repsondent believes members of the other group pay less for services than his or her household does or are better off now than his or her household compared to two years ago.

Table A-II

QUESTION 3 VOTING MODEL[a]

Estimated Coefficients and t Values

Variable	Form[b]	Coefficient	t Statistic
Intercept		-0.151	-0.60
Preferences For Service Levels[c]			
Education & Recreation[d]	Linear (1-5)	0.061	1.34
Public Safety[e]	Linear (1-5)	0.009	0.18
Sanitation & Street Repair[f]	Linear (1-5)	-0.055	-1.32
Human Services[g]	Linear (1-5)	0.041	1.00
Welfare[h]	Linear (1-5)	0.027	0.96
Perception of Inefficiency in:[i]			
Local government	0-1	0.007	0.09
State government	0-1	-0.046	-0.50
Local schools	0-1	-0.032	-0.50
Welfare spending	0-1	0.045	0.56
Attitudes about Inefficiency			
Local government employees are overpaid and do not work hard[j]	Linear (1-4)	-0.039	-1.14
Preferences for Lower Spending and Taxes[k]			
State government	0-1	0.013	0.23
Local government	0-1	0.028	0.47
Local schools	0-1	-0.085	-1.36
Expected Changes in Spending and Taxes[l]			
More money for local schools	0-1	0.200	3.75
Slower growth of property taxes	0-1	0.169	2.88
Slower growth of all taxes and spending	0-1	0.143	2.52
Preferences for Shifting Method of Finance			
Shift of education to state taxes[m]	0-1	0.040	0.69
Shift of special education to state taxes[n]	0-1	-0.042	-0.80
Shift of other local services to state taxes[o]	Linear (0-1)	0.184	1.65
Shift of certain services to user charges[p]	Linear (0-1)	0.075	0.92

Table A-II (continued)

QUESTION 3 VOTING MODEL[a]

Estimated Coefficients and t Values

Variable	Form[b]	Coefficient	t Statistic
Attitudes Toward Taxes			
State should give more aid to reduce property taxes	0-1	-0.015	-0.24
Support for redistributive taxes and aid[q]	0-1	-0.006	-0.17
Expected Changes in Taxes[l]			
State tax reform	0-1	0.125	2.16
Perception of Fiscal Position of Other Groups Relative to that of Respondent's Household[r]			
Business firms are better off today	0-1	0.079	1.45
Business firms have done better over the past two years	0-1	0.047	0.85
Poor households are better off today	0-1	0.029	0.44
Poor households have done better over the past two years	0-1	0.089	1.17
Minority households are better off today	0-1	-0.009	-0.14
Minority households have done better over the past two years	0-1	-0.015	-0.22
Household Member Employed By Public Sector			
Local schools	0-1	0.133	1.34
Local government	0-1	0.167	1.84
State government	0-1	0.090	0.67

Table A-II (continued)

QUESTION 3 VOTING MODEL[a]

Estimated Coefficients and t Values

[a] Based on 315 respondents for whom complete information was available. Estimated using ordinary least squares. The dependent variable takes on the value of 1 for a "yes" vote. The R^2 is .21.

[b] Variables enter the equation in three forms--linear, log, and dummy. Linear and log variables are scaled from one to five or one to four. Responses ranging from one to five are based on the following scale: "A lot less" = 1, "a little less" = 2, "the same" = 3, "a little more" = 4, "a lot more" = 5. Responses ranging from one to four are based on the following scale: "disagree a lot" = 1, "disagree a little" = 2, "agree a little" = 3, "agree a lot" = 4. Unless otherwise indicated, dummy variables are scored in the following manner: 1 = "agree a lot" or "agree a little" with the statement. All other responses = 0.

[c] Items in each group were clustered using factor analytic techniques. For a more detailed discussion of this see Helen F. Ladd and Julie Boatright Wilson, "Why Voters Support Tax Limitations: Evidence from Massachusetts' Proposition 2 1/2."

[d] Includes "public elementary and high school education," "adult education," "local public parks and recreation facilities," and "after school programs for students, such as music and athletics."

[e] Includes "fire fighting services" and "police services".

[f] Includes "regular garbage pick-up" and "street and sidewalk repairs."

[g] Includes "special education for children with learning problems," "mental health programs," and "services for the elderly."

[h] "Welfare or other public assistance programs."

[i] Belief that spending in these areas could be reduced by 15 percent or more without significantly reducing the quality or quantity of services.

[j] Cluster of two attitude items: "City or town employees are overpaid" and "City or town employees don't work as hard as people who work for private companies." Respondents' scores on these two items are added and divided by two. Scores range from one to four.

[k] Prefer to reduce spending and taxes by five percent or more.

[l] All expectation variables are respondent's belief that certain outcomes would have occurred if Question 3 had passed.

[m] Scored 1 if respondent wants more state (sales or income tax) financing of elementary and secondary education, and 0 otherwise.

Table A-II (continued)

[n]Scored 1 if respondent wants more state (sales or income tax) financing of special education, and 0 otherwise.

[o]Sum of responses indicating a desired shift to state income or sales taxes for police, parks, or after-school programs, divided by the number of these services for which an answer was given. (Range is 0 to 1.)

[p]Sum of responses indicating a desired shift to user charges for local transportation, adult education, and after school programs, divided by the number of these services for which an answer was given. (Range is 0 to 1.)

[q]Cluster of two attitude items: "A graduated income tax is the best way for the state to raise money," and "Taxpayers in rich cities and towns should help pay for services in poorer cities and towns." Respondents' scores on these two items are summed and divided by two. Scores range from one to four.

[r]Based on two questions: "Sometimes it seems that certain groups of people pay a lot in taxes but don't get very many services while others don't pay much in taxes but get a lot of services. Using the phrases in list one, please tell me whether ____ get a lot less than they pay for, a little less, the same amount as they pay for, a little more, or a lot more than they pay for"; and "Now we'd like you to think about two years ago. Taking into account services they get for the taxes they pay are ____ better off, worse off or about the same now as they were two years ago?". Respondents' scores for their own household are compared to their scores for business and industry, poor families and minority groups. A score of 1 is given if the repsondent believes members of the other group pay less for services than his or her household does or are better off now than his or her household compared to two years ago.

APPENDIX B

VIEWS ON FISCAL ISSUES:
SUPPORTERS OF PROPOSITION 2 1/2 AND QUESTION 3

Table B-I

AMOUNT OF VARIOUS PUBLIC SERVICES PREFERRED[a,b,c]

By Support for Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

Service Type	Total Respondents			Voted for Proposition 2 1/2			Voted for Question 3		
	Cut Back Services	Keep Services the Same	Increase Services	Cut Back Services	Keep Services the Same	Increase Services	Cut Back Services	Keep Services the Same	Increase Services
Municipal Services									
Police	10.9%	55.1%	34.1%	15.7%	60.4%	25.0%	6.0%	56.3%	37.7%
Fire fighting	9.0	71.1	19.9	13.0	75.9	11.2	5.8	68.5	25.7
Street & Sidewalk Repairs	10.0	50.1	39.9	13.9	52.8	33.4	7.8	50.9	41.3
Regular garbage pickup	12.9	73.1	14.0	18.6	72.4	9.0	9.7	76.4	14.0
Local public parks and recreation	13.8	53.1	33.1	18.9	55.4	25.7	10.1	52.6	37.4
Support of local public transportation	21.7	28.9	49.3	29.2	28.2	42.5	21.9	25.9	52.2
Local School-Related Services									
Public elementary & High School education	17.1	44.3	38.6	23.4	49.6	26.9	10.7	46.0	43.3
After-school programs	22.8	46.2	31.0	31.3	47.4	21.3	16.6	48.7	34.8
Special education	11.1	34.0	54.9	15.7	38.4	45.9	9.0	31.9	59.2
Adult education	18.0	54.4	27.5	23.3	53.3	23.5	13.0	56.5	30.5
Human Resources Services									
Mental health programs	9.5	40.4	50.1	12.3	44.3	43.3	8.4	35.9	55.7
Services for the elderly	6.0	39.5	54.6	8.2	43.8	48.1	5.1	36.0	58.4
State & community colleges and universities	17.7	54.1	28.2	24.5	55.1	20.4	10.8	53.4	35.8

Table B-I (continued)

AMOUNT OF VARIOUS PUBLIC SERVICES PREFERRED[a,b,c]

By Support for Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

Service Type	Total Respondents			Voted for Proposition 2 1/2			Voted for Question 3		
	Cut Back Services	Keep Services the Same	Increase Services	Cut Back Services	Keep Services the Same	Increase Services	Cut Back Services	Keep Services the Same	Increase Services
Legal Services									
Courts and judges	20.7%	46.4%	32.8%	26.5%	44.1%	29.4%	20.1%	42.4%	37.5%
Public Assistance									
Welfare or other public assistance	54.6	28.7	16.7	67.9	23.0	9.0	50.4	30.0	19.6
Local Services	19.7	43.9	36.5	30.5	44.8	24.7	13.7	44.8	41.5
State Services	38.7	25.9	35.4	53.7	23.1	23.2	31.7	27.2	41.1

[a]Based on the question: "Think about the services provided by the state or local government to residents of your town or city. For each service I read, please tell me whether state or local government should be providing a lot less, a little less, the same amount, a little more or a lot more of this service. Remember, if government provides less services state or local taxes will be reduced, and if government provides more services, state or local taxes will be increased. If the service is not available to residents in your city or town, please let me know. Let's begin with _____. Which phrase in the first list describes how much more or less ____ state or local government should provide?"

[b]Of the 1,586 respondents interviewed, 722 report voting "yes" on Proposition 2 1/2 and 431 report voting "yes" on Question 3. Percentages are based on eligible respondents answering each question and total 100% across a row for supporters of each group. Differences between the two groups of supporters of at least 7% are significant at the .05 level.

[c]"Cut back services" includes "cut back a lot" and "cut back a little". "Increase services" includes "increase a lot" and "increase a little".

Table B-II

DESIRED CHANGES IN TAXING AND SPENDING[a,b]

By Vote on Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

	Total Respondents	Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2	Voted Yes on Question 3	Difference: Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2 Minus Voted Yes on Question 3
State government spending and taxing should be:				
Increased	15.9%	10.6%	18.8%	-8.2%
Kept the same	20.5	14.2	21.0	-6.8
Decreased	62.8	75.1	60.2	+14.9
Local government spending and taxing should be:				
Increased	12.4	7.6	11.7	-4.1
Kept the same	27.9	21.8	33.3	-11.5
Decreased	58.6	70.6	55.0	+15.6
Local public school spending and taxing should be:				
Increased	20.0	17.8	21.0	-3.2
Kept the same	35.6	24.3	41.0	-6.7
Decreased	44.4	57.9	38.0	+19.1

[a]Based on the questions: "Compared to what the state government now spends, by what percentage, if any, would you like to see state government taxing and spending increase or decrease. You may answer any percent increase or decrease from 1% to 100% or tell me you want it to stay the same. And by what percentage, if any, would you like to see local government taxing and spending increase or decrease? And by what percentage, if any, would you like to see local public school taxes and spending increase or decrease?"

[b]Of the 1,586 respondents interviewed, 722 report voting "yes" on Proposition 2 1/2 and 431 report voting "yes" on Question 3. Percentages are based on eligible respondents answering each question. Differences between the two groups of supporters of at least 7% are significant at the .05 level.

Table B-III

BELIEFS THAT SPENDING CAN BE CUT WITHOUT AFFECTING THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF SERVICES: POSSIBLE CUTBACKS OF LESS THAN 5 PERCENT/ POSSIBLE CUTBACKS OF 15 PERCENT OR MORE[a,b,c]

Among Supporters of Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

	Total Respondents <5%/≥15%	Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2 <5%/≥15%	Voted Yes on Question 3 <5%/≥15%	Difference: Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2 Minus Voted Yes on Question 3 <5%/≥15%
Municipal Services				
Police	51%/27%	44%/33%	57%/20%	-13%/13%
Fire fighting	NA	NA	NA	--
Street & sidewalk repairs	45/36	40/41	46/34	-6/7
Regular garbage pickup	51/30	51/34	53/26	-2/8
Local public parks and recreation	NA	NA	NA	--
Support of local public transportation	NA	NA	NA	--
Local School-related Services				
Public elementary and high school education	38/37	27/48	44/33	-17/15
After-school programs	42/34	35/40	48/29	-13/11
Special education	58/22	51/26	61/19	-10/7
Adult education	31/45	27/50	35/41	-8/9
Human Resources Services				
Mental health programs	NA	NA	NA	--
Services for the elderly	NA	NA	NA	--
State and community colleges & universities	35/40	29/66	41/35	-12/31
Legal Services				
Courts and judges	NA	NA	NA	--
Public Assistance				
Welfare or other public assistance	18/67	11/75	17/65	-6/10
State Services	11/73	6/80	13/69	-7/11
Local Services	18/60	10/69	20/55	-10/14

(Footnotes on following page)

[a]Based on the questions: "Now let's talk about some specific services. People we've talked to believe that government could cut back spending on these services by eliminating waste, inefficiency and other problems. By what percentage, if any, do you think government could cut back spending on _____ without significantly affecting the quality or amount of services provided? And by what percentage, if any, do you think state government could cut taxes and spending without significantly cutting the amount of services? Overall, by what percentage, if any, do you think your local government could cut taxes and spending without significantly cutting the amount of services?"

[b]Each entry has two numbers. The number to the left of the slash is the percentage of respondents who believe that spending cuts of 5% or more would significantly affect the quality or amount of service provided. The number to the right of the slash is the percentage of respondents who believe spending for that service could be cut by 15% or more without significantly affecting the quality or amount of services provided. Percentages are based on those responding to the question. NA means that the question was not asked.

[c]Of the 1,586 respondents interviewed, 722 report voting "yes" on Proposition 2 1/2 and 431 report voting "yes" on Question 3. Percentages are based on eligible respondents answering each question. Differences between the two groups of at least 7% are significant at the .05 level.

Table B-IV

ATTITUDES TOWARD GOVERNMENT AND TAXES[a,b,c]

By Vote on Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

	Total Respondents	Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2	Voted Yes on Question 3	Difference: Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2 Minus Voted Yes on Question 3
The government should make sure that each family has enough to live on	65.5%	58.6%	65.1%	-6.5%
People expect too many services from government	68.4	77.7	69.5	+8.2
Government interferes too much in people's lives	76.5	83.0	76.8	+6.2
People now on welfare could find jobs if they really tried	78.8	84.8	77.4	+7.4
City or town employees are overpaid	47.1	55.5	39.5	+16.0
City or town employees don't work as hard as people who work for private companies	66.7	76.0	62.3	+13.7
Proposition 13 in California showed that taxes can be cut without cuts in services	63.8	82.4	56.2	+26.2
Corruption is common in my local government	63.4	63.3	63.7	-0.4
Corruption is common in my state government	87.8	89.4	88.9	+0.5

Table B-IV (continued)

ATTITUDES TOWARD GOVERNMENT AND TAXES[a,b,c]

By Vote on Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

	Total Respondents	Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2	Voted Yes on Question 3	Difference: Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2 Minus Voted Yes on Question 3
A graduated income tax is the best way for the state to raise money	61.9%	59.9%	65.4%	-5.5%
A sales tax is the best way for the state to raise money[c]	73.1	73.8	77.0	-3.2
The property tax is the best way for cities and towns to raise money for city services	58.2	55.5	59.6	-4.1
It's OK for property taxes to rise as fast as the cost of living	21.8	18.6	20.3	-1.7
State government should give more money to the cities and towns so local property taxes can be kept down	77.2	75.2	83.5	-8.3
Taxpayers in rich cities and towns should help pay for services in poorer cities and towns	41.8	34.6	42.9	-8.3
A cut in property taxes would benefit homeowners more than business and industry	59.6	66.3	55.7	+10.6
When property taxes go up, landlords just raise rents	89.4	89.5	88.7	+0.8
When business property taxes go up, businesses just raise their prices to consumers	88.0	88.6	88.1	+0.5

Table B-IV (continued)

ATTITUDES TOWARD GOVERNMENT AND TAXES[a,b,c]

By Vote on Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

	Total Respondents	Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2	Voted Yes on Question 3	Difference: Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2 Minus Voted Yes on Question 3
Political Ideology				
Very conservative	8.9%	10.0%	6.6%	+3.4%
Fairly conservative	26.4	30.1	28.2	+1.9
Middle of the road	38.6	42.1	38.1	+4.0
Fairly liberal	19.3	13.8	18.9	-5.1
Very liberal	6.8	3.9	8.2	-4.3

[a]Based on the questions: "Now I'd like to get your opinions on tax and other government issues. For each statement I read, tell me whether you agree a lot, agree a little, disagree a little or disagree a lot. How much do you agree or disagree that _____?" and "How would you describe yourself politically? Would you say you are very conservative, fairly conservative, middle of the road, fiarly liberal or very liberal?"

[b]Each entry (except those for political ideology) is the percentage of respondents who agree "a lot" or "a little" that the particular outcome will occur. Of the 1,586 respondents interviewed, 722 report voting "yes" on Proposition 2 1/2 and 431 report voting "yes" on Question 3. Percentages are based on eligible respondents answering each question. Differences between the two groups of supporters of at least 7% are significant at the .05 level.

[c]This question was asked of only a subsample of respondents.

Table B-V

PREFERRED METHOD FOR FINANCING VARIOUS PUBLIC SERVICES[a,b]

By Support for Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

	Total Respondents			Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2			Voted Yes on Question 3			Difference: Voted for Proposition 2 1/2 minus Voted for Question 3		
	Greater Share of Money From			Greater Share of Money From			Greater Share of Money From			Greater Share of Money From		
	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees
Municipal Services												
Police	51%	22%	2%	54%	20%	2%	54%	24%	2%	0%	-4%	0%
Fire Fighting[c]	51	16	1	57	12	1	53	22	0	+4	-10	+1
Street & Sidewalk Repair[c]	51	16	2	54	14	1	56	17	0	-2	-3	+1
Regular Garbage Pickup[c]	42	10	17	40	10	18	48	5	20	-8	+5	-2
Local Public Parks and Recreation	49	19	8	50	18	9	52	21	8	-2	-3	+1
Support of Local Public Transportation	18	36	26	16	33	30	19	38	26	-3	-5	+4
Local School-Related Services												
Public Elementary & High School Education	34	37	7	35	34	10	37	42	6	-2	-8	+4
After-school Programs	39	20	20	40	15	26	42	21	18	-2	-6	+8
Special Education	15	60	6	15	59	7	14	66	4	+1	-7	+3
Adult Education	20	26	32	21	23	34	23	27	30	-2	-4	+4

Table B-V (continued)

PREFERRED METHOD FOR FINANCING VARIOUS PUBLIC SERVICES[a,b]

By Support for Proposition 2 1/2 and Question 3

	Total Respondents			Voted Yes on Proposition 2 1/2			Voted Yes on Question 3			Difference: Voted for Proposition 2 1/2 minus Voted for Question 3		
	Greater Share of Money From			Greater Share of Money From			Greater Share of Money From			Greater Share of Money From		
	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees	Property Taxes	State Taxes	User Fees
Human Resources Services												
Mental Health Programs	5%	72%	5%	6%	71%	5%	4%	75%	5%	+2%	-4%	0%
Services for the Elderly[c]	16	56	3	14	59	3	22	55	3	-8	+4	0
State & Community Colleges & Universities	3	58	21	3	56	25	3	64	17	0	-8	+8
Legal Services												
Courts and Judges	9	54	10	6	58	3	9	59	1	-3	-1	+2
Public Assistance												
Welfare or other Public Assistance	8	59	8	7	63	7	7	62	7	0	+1	0

[a]Based on the question: "For each service I read, would you like to keep the financing the way it now is or to see a greater share of the money come from local property taxes, from state income taxes, from state sales taxes, or a greater share from fees paid by users of the service?

[b]Of the 1,586 respondents interviewed, 722 report voting "yes" on Proposition 2 1/2 and 431 report voting "yes" on Question 3. Percentages are based on eleigible respondents answering each question, and total to 100% across a row for each group of respondents. Differences between the two groups of supporters of at least 7% are significant at the .05 level.

[c]Asked only of a subsample of respondents. Differences between each group of 10% or more are significant at the .05 level.

APPENDIX C

EXPECTED EFFECTS OF PROPOSITION 2 1/2

Table C-1

EXPECTATION THAT PROPOSITION 2 1/2 WILL LEAD TO CUTS IN VARIOUS EDUCATION SERVICES[a,b]

By Demographic Characteristics

	Public Elementary and Secondary Education	After School Programs	Special Education	Adult Education	Public Colleges
Total	56.4%	71.4%	49.9%	65.9%	54.4%
Sex					
Female	57.3	69.5	51.9	64.0	52.1
Male	55.4	73.3	47.9	67.9	56.7
Race					
Non-white	60.2	63.7	59.1	60.4	52.8
White	56.1	71.8	49.4	66.3	54.5
Religion					
Catholic	54.6	70.8	47.5	64.8	54.3
Jewish	67.4	82.6	55.6	84.4	61.8
Protestant	52.6	68.1	49.2	60.1	52.3
Other, no religion	64.4	74.8	56.4	72.9	55.6
Stage in Life Cycle					
Young, no children	60.6	76.1	59.0	65.8	60.4
Children present, oldest <6	58.8	72.2	49.7	66.5	57.7
Children present, oldest 6-17	56.7	72.8	51.9	68.7	53.6
Older adults, no children	56.0	71.5	45.3	70.1	52.2
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	48.2	60.4	38.6	53.5	47.7
Service Usage					
Use this service	57.8	75.2	51.1	62.0	54.3
Do not use this service	55.7	70.6	49.8	67.0	42.4
Education					
Less than high school	51.7	69.4	50.0	61.8	49.0
High School degree	49.9	64.6	44.6	60.6	48.9
Some college	56.6	72.0	51.2	64.7	56.8
College degree	60.0	75.6	51.1	72.0	60.5
Graduate school	73.2	84.4	60.1	78.0	60.4

Table C-II

ANTICIPATED EFFECTS OF PROPOSITION 2 1/2 ON SCHOOL BUDGETS

By Demographic Characteristics

	Proposition 2 1/2 will:	
	Decrease funds for local public schools	Give local voters more control over school spending
Total	69.6%	71.0%
Sex		
Female	69.4	67.9
Male	69.0	73.7
Race		
Non-white	56.2	60.7
White	70.0	71.4
Religion		
Catholic	68.8	74.4
Jewish	74.4	61.5
Protestant	68.6	69.0
Other, no religion	69.3	66.8
Stage in Life Cycle		
Young, no children	71.5	63.3
Children present, oldest <6	71.9	70.7
Children present, oldest 6-17	67.4	69.8
Older adults, no children	69.9	73.2
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	67.0	80.9
Service Usage		
Children in public schools	66.2	70.3
No children in public schools	70.6	71.1
Education		
Less than high school	66.0	69.8
High School degree	65.6	76.0
Some college	66.3	72.6
College degree	71.9	67.0
Graduate school	83.7	60.4

Table C-II (continued)

ANTICIPATED EFFECTS OF PROPOSITION 2 1/2 ON SCHOOL BUDGETS

By Demographic Characteristics (continued)

	Proposition 2 1/2 will:	
	Decrease funds for local public schools	Give local voters more control over school spending
Household Income		
Less than $10,000	66.9%	68.4%
$10,000 to <$20,000	66.8	68.2
$20,000 to <$30,000	69.5	72.9
$30,000 to <$50,000	71.6	73.3
$50,000 or more	77.6	68.1
Occupation of Household Head		
Professional	75.0	67.5
Managerial	71.8	72.7
Clerical, sales	64.6	72.0
Blue collar	66.7	74.1
Service	61.8	61.0
Not reported	66.9	71.8
Government Employee		
Educational employee	72.8	63.8
Local government employee	81.2	64.5
State government employee	64.3	70.2
Federal government employee	74.6	70.3
No local, state, or federal employees in household	67.7	72.1
Local Tax Price		
Owners: Less than 75% of community avg.	68.4	75.1
Owners: 75% to <100% of community avg.	70.1	72.5
Owners: 100% to <125% of community avg.	66.8	76.0
Owners: 125% or more of community avg.	68.3	71.8
Owners: Taxes not reported	66.4	76.1
Renters: never owned, no plans to own	60.9	57.8
Renters: Ever owned	70.4	57.4
Renters: Plan to own	65.8	66.7
Neither rent nor own	74.4	65.1

Table C-II (continued)

ANTICIPATED EFFECTS OF PROPOSITION 2 1/2 ON SCHOOL BUDGETS

By Demographic Characteristics (continued)

	Proposition 2 1/2 will:	
	Decrease funds for local public schools	Give local voters more control over school spending
Political Ideology		
Very conservative	71.2%	73.3%
Fairly conservative	71.0	74.2
Middle of the road	66.7	74.4
Fairly liberal	69.8	63.8
Very liberal	76.0	56.1

[a] Based on the question: "Next I will read a list of some of the effects that the passage of Proposition 2 1/2 might have in Massachusetts. Look at list three that you wrote down from "agree a lot" to "disagree a lot". To what extent do you agree or disagree that Proposition 2 1/2 will _____?"

[b] Each entry is the percentage of respondents who "agree a lot" or "agree a little" with that particular statement. Percentages are based on those responding to the question.

[c] "State government employee" includes county employees.

APPENDIX D

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCES

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCES

Table D-I is a guide for determining the significance (two standard errors) of differences in percentages between any two subgroups in the overall sample. The size of the difference necessary for significance decreases as the sample sizes increase and as the percentages being compared move away from 50 percent in either direction. Thus, a separate table is presented for each of four sets of percentages. The entries in each cell define the range of necessary differences for samples of varying sizes. The lower number is the difference required for significance between two simple random samples. The higher number, 1.25 times the lower number, is a conservative estimate of the difference required for significance when other sample designs are used.

A stratified random cluster sample plan was used in this study. Stratification reduces the size of the standard errors relative to those in simple random samples; clustering increases the size of the standard errors. Because the sampling plan incorporated a large number of clusters (65) with a small number of interviews in each cluster (15 to 25), any increase in standard errors due to clustering should be minor and more than offset by the decreases gained through stratification. Thus the entries at the lower end of each scale represent conservative estimates of the difference in percentages required for significance between any two subgroups in this study.

The sizes of the subgroups analyzed in this paper are presented in Table D-II.

Table D-I

EXAMPLE OF SAMPLING ERRORS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCENTAGES[1]

No. of Interviews	No. of Interviews							
	2000	1000	700	500	400	300	200	100
For Percentages from 35 to 65								
2000	3.2–4.0	3.9–4.9	4.4–5.5	5.0–6.2	5.5–6.9	6.2–7.8	7.4–9.2	10–12
1000		4.5–5.6	4.9–6.1	5.5–6.9	5.9–7.4	6.6–8.3	7.7–9.6	10–13
700			5.3–6.6	5.9–7.4	6.3–7.9	6.9–8.6	8.0–10	11–13
500				6.3–7.9	6.7–8.4	7.3–9.1	8.4–10	11–13
400					7.1–8.9	7.6–9.5	8.7–11	11–14
300						8.2–10	9.1–11	12–14
200							10–12	12–15
100								14–17
For Percentages around 20 and 80								
2000	2.5–3.1	3.1–3.9	3.5–4.4	4.0–5.0	4.4–5.5	5.0–6.2	5.9–7.4	8.2–9.8
1000		3.6–4.5	3.9–4.9	4.4–5.5	4.7–5.9	5.3–6.6	6.2–7.8	8.4–10
700			4.3–5.4	4.7–5.9	5.0–6.2	5.5–6.9	6.4–8.0	8.6–10
500				5.1–6.4	5.4–6.8	5.8–7.2	6.7–8.4	8.8–11
400					5.7–7.1	6.1–7.6	6.9–8.6	9.0–11
300						6.5–8.1	7.3–9.1	9.2–11
200							8.0–10	9.8–12
100								11–14
For Percentages around 10 and 90								
2000	1.9–2.4	2.3–2.9	2.6–3.2	3.0–3.8	3.3–4.1	3.7–4.6	4.4–5.5	
1000		2.7–3.4	3.0–3.8	3.3–4.1	3.6–4.5	4.0–5.0	4.6–5.8	
700			3.2–4.0	3.5–4.4	3.8–4.8	4.1–5.1	4.8–6.0	
500				3.8–4.8	4.0–5.0	4.4–5.5	5.0–6.2	
400					4.2–5.2	4.6–5.8	5.2–6.9	
300						4.9–6.1	5.5–6.9	
200							6.0–7.5	
For Percentages around 5 and 95								
2000	1.4–1.8	1.7–2.1	1.9–2.4	2.2–2.8	2.4–3.0	2.7–3.4		
1000		1.9–2.4	2.1–2.6	2.4–3.0	2.6–3.2	2.9–3.6		
700			2.3–2.9	2.6–3.2	2.7–3.4	3.0–3.8		
500				2.8–3.5	2.9–3.6	3.2–4.0		
400					3.1–3.9	3.3–4.1		
300						3.6–4.5		

TABLE 14.1.III Example of Sampling Errors of Differences between Percentages

The values shown are the differences required for significance (two standard errors) in comparisons of percentages derived from *two different subgroups* of the survey. Two values—low and high—are given for each cell.

These generalized and approximate values of $2\,se\,(p - p')$ represent the results of many computations. The low values are merely $2[PQ(1/n + 1/n')]^{1/4}$, corresponding to two simple random samples. The high values are about 1.25 greater. Most of the actually computed values of the standard error fell between these two boundaries. (*Source:* Freedman, Whelpton, and Campbell [1959].)

[1]Leslie Kish, Survey Sampling. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965, p. 580.

Table D-II

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IN EACH DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORY

Demographic Characteristics	Number in Sample
Total	1586
Sex	
Male	798
Female	788
Race	
Non-white	96
White	1,490
Religion	
Catholic	781
Jewish	92
Protestant	453
Other, no religion	260
Stage in Life Cycle	
Young, no children	324
Children present, oldest <6	182
Children present, oldest 6-17	542
Older adults, no children	307
Elderly (60+) adults, no children	231
Services Used	
Public elementary and secondary education	519
After school programs	300
Special education	132
Adult education	329
Public colleges	346
Education	
Less than high school	178
High school degree	520
Some college	353
College degree	321
Graduate school	180
Income	
Less than $10,000	169
$10,000 to <$20,000	484
$20,000 to <$30,000	477
$30,000 to <$50,000	356
$50,000 or more	69

Table D-II (continued)

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IN EACH DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORY

Demographic Characteristics	Number in Sample
Occupation of Household Head	
Professional	395
Managerial	305
Clerical, sales	195
Blue collar	418
Service	106
Not reported, no occupation	167
Government Employee	
Educational employee	96
Local government employee	121
State government employee	57
Federal government employee	65
No local, state or federal employees in household	1,247
Local Tax Share	
Owners: Less than 75% of community avg.	225
Owners: 75% to <100% of community avg.	251
Owners: 100% to <125% of community avg.	175
Owners: ≥125% of community avg.	227
Owners: Taxes not reported	113
Renters: Never owned, no plans to	256
Renters: Ever owned	176
Renters: Plan to own	120
Neither rent nor own	43
Political Ideology	
Very conservative	136
Fairly conservative	405
Middle of the road	593
Fairly liberal	297
Very liberal	104